

IV. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in this Application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-7 have been amended, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious allowance of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolosky (US Pat. No. 6,477,544, hereinafter, “Bolosky”), in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter, “APA”). Applicants have amended claims 1 and 3-7, and submit that Bolosky fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the invention as claimed herein.

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 at line 14 *et seq.* to include the additional features of:

wherein the first file may be opened (Claim 2) and
modified (Specification p. 10, ln. 20), the opening including:
entering a command from an application to open a file;
(claim 2)
displaying the file hierarchy and selecting one of the at least
one folder; (claim 2)
selecting a file having a different name from the first file;
(claim 2)
if the file to be opened is not a shortcut file, opening the
first file; (claim 2) and
if the file to be opened is a shortcut file, pointing to and
opening the first file; (claim 2)
and wherein, if the first file is modified, a modified version
of the first file may be saved in one of two ways according to the
user's preference, (Specification, p. 10, ln. 20-31 (“Save”
command and “Save multiple” command))

a first method including saving the modified version of the first file in the first file, regardless of whether the first file was opened via the first file or one of the at least one shortcut file pointing to and opening the first file, and (*Id.*, ln. 20-24 (“Save” command”)

a second method including saving the modified version of the first file to at least one, but not all of, the at least one shortcuts according to the user’s selection (*Id.*, ln. 24-31 (“Save multiple” command”)).

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by this Amendment, as support may be found in the specification as filed as noted parenthetically above. Applicants further note that the amendments to claims 3-7 also do not include any new subject matter, as they are merely amendments to punctuation, for improved clarity.

Applicants respectfully submit that Bolosky does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 1 including, in relevant part, the above-recited features. At col. 10, ln. 36-45, Bolosky teaches that “writing to a SIS link file 70 [analogous to a shortcut file] does not change the common store file 68 [analogous to the first file], since other links to the common store file 68 are logically separate. Instead, write requests are written to space allocated therefore in the link file 70. ... In this manner, changing the data via one link does not result in changes seen by the other links. Thus, by ‘logically separate’ it is meant that in a SIS link, changes made to one link file are not seen by users of another link file, in contrast to simply having separate file names, protections, attributes, and so on.” This clearly contrasts with, and in fact teaches away from, the claimed invention, in which the user may choose to save modifications to a file in one of two ways. The first of those two ways of saving includes “saving the modified version of the opened file in the opened file, regardless of whether the opened file was opened via the opened file or one of the at least one shortcut files pointing to the opened file,” which is the direct opposite of Bolosky’s logical separation concept. Specifically, where Bolosky’s files are completely

logically separate, the first claimed method of saving allows files and shortcuts to those files to be modified in a single saving operation. The second of those two claimed ways of saving includes “saving the modified version of the opened file to at least one, but no fewer than all of, the at least one shortcuts, according to the user’s selection,” which is also contrary to Bolosky’s teachings, in that the user may save to “at least” one file. Bolosky further teaches that “the user generally does not know whether a file is a SIS link file or a regular file” (Bolosky, col. 7, ln. 24-25), which is also inconsistent with the claimed features.

In view of at least these deficiencies in the Bolosky reference, as well as the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants submit that Bolosky does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the invention of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a).

With respect to claim 7, Applicants note that this claim is amended analogously to claim 1, and includes features similar in scope to those already addressed above with respect to the same. Further, the Office relies on the same arguments and interpretations of Bolosky and APA as discussed above with respect to claim 1 (*see* Office Action, p. 12). To this extent, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 for the above-stated reasons.

With respect to dependent claims 3-6 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claims 1 and 7, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 2-6 and 8.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jayme M. Torelli/
Jayme M. Torelli
Reg. No. 62.735

Date: August 20, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047